

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: MOON-SHIK KANG, ET AL.)
Serial No.: 10/525,463) Group Art Unit: 2821
Filed: February 24, 2005)
For: APPARATUS FOR SUPPLYING) Examiner:
POWER, BACKLIGHT ASSEMBLY) CABUCOS, MARIE G.
AND LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY) Confirmation No. 5352
APPARATUS HAVING THE SAME)

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

In response to the Final Office Action mailed September 20, 2006, and in conjunction with the Notice of Appeal filed concurrently herewith, the Applicants submit the following remarks in support of the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review:

REMARKS

The present submission is responsive to the Final Office Action of September 20, 2006, in which claims 1-17 are presently pending. The amendment filed July 5, 2005 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a) for the reasons stated on page 2 of the Office action. Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Praiswater (U.S. Patent No. 5,939,830, hereinafter “Praiswater”) for the reasons stated on pages 3- 7 of the Office action. Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Yung-Yi Hsu (U.S. Patent No. 6,693,396, hereinafter “Hsu”) for the reasons stated on pages 7-11 of the Office action. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Beom Young Hwang (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0003525, hereinafter “Hwang”) for the reasons stated on pages 12 and 13 of the Office action.

Amendment Objection

The Examiner objects to the amendment filed on July 5, 2006 in response to the Office action mailed April 5, 2006 under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a). The Examiner states that the limitation “the sensing section wirelessly connected to the power transforming section” in claims 1, 5 and 17 allegedly introduces new matter not supported by the original disclosure. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Support for the limitation “the sensing section wirelessly connected to the power transforming section” in claims 1, 5 and 17 can be found at least in FIGS. 1 and 3, as well as at least at page 6, lines 22-27; page 7, lines 10-11; page 9, lines 2-21; page 12, lines 11-23; page 14, lines 8-10; and page 20, lines 9-10, of the specification as originally filed. In particular with reference to FIG. 3, an “antenna” is disposed adjacent to the output terminal of the transformer 300 for sensing voltage outputted from the transformer 300 connected to both end terminals of the lamp LP. “Accordingly, it is able to know that the current is normally supplied to the lamp LP based on the sensed voltage value by the antenna.” (Page 9, lines 2-6). “The signal 401 sensed by the antenna connected to the secondary winding of the transformer 300 has a level lowered by the second diode D2” (Emphasis added.) (Page 9, lines 20-21.) (See also page 14, lines 8-9 describing “the sensing section 400 includes one antenna 410 and the antenna 410 is connected to the second coil T2”.) It is respectfully noted that an “antenna” by definition

transmits and/or receives electromagnetic waves from an electronic circuit through a wireless connection therebetween. For example, m-w.com defines antenna as “2 : a usually metallic device (as a rod or wire) for radiating or receiving radio waves.” Thus, FIG. 3 illustrates the antenna 401 of the sensing section 400 “wirelessly connected” to the transformer 300 of the power transforming section.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the limitation “the sensing section wirelessly connected to the power transforming section” in claims 1, 5 and 17 does not introduce new matter and is supported by the original disclosure. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the amendment filed July 20, 2006 under § 132(a) be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Praisewater (U.S. Patent No. 5,939,830) stating that Praisewater discloses all elements of the abovementioned claims primarily in Column 7, Lines 36–39; Column 4, Lines 5–9; Column 7, Lines 25–36; Column 5, Lines 1–4; Column 4, Lines 1–2; Column 4, Lines 5–9; Column 4, Lines 9–16; and Column 7, Lines 36–39. Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102(b) rejections for the reasons stated below.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements “arranged as in the claim.” *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1271 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Missing elements may not be supplied by the knowledge of one skilled in the art or the disclosure of another reference. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 780, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773, 777 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

It is respectfully submitted that the invention of the present application with respect to amended independent claims 1, 5 and 17 recite that the sensing section is wirelessly connected to the power transforming/outputting section. In contrast, Column 7, Lines 36–39, of the Praisewater reference discloses “analog comparator circuits can be used to detect resonance frequency of the circuit by monitoring the voltage at a particular node such as the transformer centertap”. Thus, Praisewater discloses monitoring the voltage at a particular node such as at the

centertap of the transformer which corresponds to the primary winding and not the secondary winding of the output transformer.

Praisewater does not teach or suggest, the sensing section **wirelessly connected** to the power transforming section, as in amended independent claims 1, 5 and 17. Thus, claims 1, 5 and 17, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-4 and 6-16, define over Praisewater.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the § 102(b) rejections to claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 13-17 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hsu (U.S. Patent No. 6,693,396), stating that Hsu discloses all elements of the abovementioned claims primarily in Fig. 1 and col. 1, lines 44-65. Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102(e) rejections for the reasons stated below.

It is respectfully submitted that the invention of the present application with respect to amended independent claims 1, 5 and 17 recite that the sensing section is wirelessly connected to the power transforming section. In contrast, Column 1, Lines 44-65 of the Hsu reference discloses “the lamp current is sensed with a resistor R1 in series with one lead of the lamp”, as also shown in Figure 1 of the Hsu reference. Therefore the sensing section of Hsu is connected by wire to the lamp which is different than “wirelessly connected to the power transforming section”, as in the amended claims 1,5 and 17.

Hsu does not teach or suggest, the sensing section **wirelessly connected** to the power transforming section, as in amended independent claims 1, 5 and 17. Thus, claims 1, 5 and 17, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-4 and 6-16, define over Hsu.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the § 102(e) rejections to claims 1-17 be withdrawn.

Also, claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hwang (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0003525), the Examiner stating that Hwang discloses all elements of the abovementioned claim primarily in Fig. 4. Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102(b) rejection for the reasons stated below.

It is respectfully submitted that the invention of the present application with respect to amended independent claim 5 recites that the sensing section is wirelessly connected to the

power outputting section. In contrast, Figure 4 of the Hwang reference discloses a sensing section including a secondary power transformer T2 having a primary connected by wire to the lamp 350 and the secondary of transformer T1. Therefore the sensing section of Hwang connected by wire to the lamp which is different than “wirelessly connected to the power transforming section”, as in the amended claim 5.

Hwang does not teach or suggest, the sensing section **wirelessly connected** to the power transforming section, as in amended independent claim 5. Thus, claim 5 defines over Hwang.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the § 102(b) rejection to claim 5 be withdrawn.

For the above stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the final rejection of claims 1-17 is in error and that the same are allowable over the art of record. The fee set forth in 37 CFR 41.20(b)(1) is enclosed herewith. However, if any fees are due with respect to this submission, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Reg. No.: 43,801
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
PTO Customer No. 23413

Date: November 20, 2006